



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,899	03/23/2001	Sara H. Basson	YOR920010071 US1	6303

7590

06/17/2004

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

OSMAN, RAMY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

H

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/816,899

Applicant(s)

BASSON ET AL.

Examiner

Ramy M Osman

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 13 line 10, include the omitted Patent application number.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1,2,5,7 and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tso et al (US Patent No 6,421,733).

4. In reference to claim 1, Tso teaches a method of providing access to content (column 1 lines 25-67 and column 8 lines 40-50), comprising:

receiving a request for content from a client device (column 1 lines 25-67 and column 2 lines 44-67);

determining an accessibility tool to be used in providing the content to a user of the client device (column 3 lines 7-53 and column 7 lines 15-67);

processing the requested content using the accessibility tool to produce processed content (column 9 lines 25-50); and

outputting the processed content to the client device (column 9 lines 25-50).

5. In reference to claim 2, Tso teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising redirecting the request for content to a mirror source of the requested content, wherein the mirror source provides the requested content in a format useable by the accessibility tool (column 4 lines 1-5 & 38-67 and column 15 lines 30-65, Tso discloses server-side cache).

6. In reference to claim 5, Tso teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the accessibility tool is one of a plug-in device to a web browser application, an applet, and an accessibility tool on a server (column 4 lines 1-15 and column 10).

7. In reference to claim 7, Tso teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising storing an indicator of at least one of a supplier of the requested content, the requested content, the accessibility tool, and the user (column 3 lines 30-60, column 9 and column 10 lines 1-35).

8. In reference to claim 11, Tso teaches the method of claim 1, wherein determining the accessibility tool includes looking-up an identifier of the user in a registered user directory (column 9 lines 25-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3,4,8,9 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (US Patent No 6,421,733) in view of Webber (US Patent No 6,167,378).

Tso teaches the method of claim 1 above, including identifying a supplier of the accessibility tool (columns 3&4). Tso fails to explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises:

Determining an amount of funds to be transferred to the supplier of the accessibility tool; wherein determining an amount of funds includes calculating a percentage of an amount of funds generated by a source of the requested content based on the request for content; determining if a supplier of the accessibility tool is to be paid for use of the accessibility tool; transferring funds to the supplier of the accessibility tool if the supplier is to be paid for use of the accessibility tool; calculating an amount of the funds to be transferred to the supplier based on contractual terms agreed to by the supplier; and wherein the contractual terms are retrieved from an agreement database.

However, Webber teaches electronic fund transfer system which includes determining and calculating an amount of funds to be transferred to a supplier, along with agreed upon contractual terms which are stored and retrieved from a database (column 1 line 55 – column 2

line 15, column 5 lines 1-16, column 8 lines 25-40, column 11 lines 1-60 and column 12 lines 10-35).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Tso by incorporating an electronic fund transfer system with contractual terms as per the teachings of Webber because these are the commonly used steps in providing services for fees over the Internet.

11. Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (US Patent No 6,421,733) in view of Albayrak et al (US Patent No 6,662,163).

Tso teaches the method of claim 1 above. Tso fails to explicitly teach wherein the accessibility tool is one or more of automatic speech recognition, a screen reader, and an intelligent agent. However, Albayrak teaches an accessibility module used for requesting content and speech recognition in the context of a client browsing pages from a server (Abstract, Summary and column 10 lines 45-67 and column 11 lines 1-40).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Tso by making the accessibility toll a speech recognition tool as per the teachings of Albayrak so that it can be used for the purpose of speech recognition in the context of a client browsing pages from a server.

12. Claims 12-31 do not define any new limitations above the teachings of claims 1-11 and are therefore rejected for the above mentioned reasons.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M Osman whose telephone number is (703) 305-8050.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 305-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO
June 8, 2004


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100